

App. No. 10/099,775  
Attorney Docket 3206.2.1 NP

### **Remarks**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action. Further, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic conference held on 26 January 2006, wherein Mikulas and the Claims of the present application were discussed as well as the objection to the Drawings.

During the telephonic conference, the following language was agreed upon for use in Claim 1, "wherein first node A, second node B, and third node C form a base plane and the fourth strut does not lie in the base plane" and that such would result in a withdrawal of the present rejection of the claims under Mikulas. Further, it was agreed that should the specification be amended in the description for Figure 1 to include appropriate references to A, B, and C, the objection to the Drawings would be withdrawn. The Applicant further thanks the Examiner for noting that upon appropriate amendment as discussed, the finality of the Written Office Action would be withdrawn if additional art is presented in a further Written Office Action.

### **Drawings**

With respect to the objection to the Drawings for failing to include the reference numerals "A", "B", and "C", Applicant has amended the specification to include the references "A," "B," and "C."

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103**

Claim 1 has been amended as discussed in the telephonic interview with the Examiner to include language more clearly not taught by Mikulas. Accordingly, wherein


App. No. 10/099,775  
Attorney Docket 3206.2.1 NP

all the claims of the present application depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 1 and wherein Claim 1 includes limitations not taught nor suggested by the prior art, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

**Conclusion**

For these reasons, it is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. Applicant believes the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendment, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Michael W. Starkweather  
Registration No. 34,441  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 1/30/06

Michael W. Starkweather  
Starkweather and Associates  
9035 South 1300 East  
Suite 200  
Sandy, Utah 84094  
Telephone: 801/272-8368